

MAR 5 1956

# Fulbright On Dulles And The New Soviet Line

STATINTL

By C. P. IVES

The twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party signaled a shift in Moscow tactics. Senator Fulbright, of Arkansas, has been one of the liberal Democrats who denounce Secretary Dulles's reaction to this shift as unvigilant and over-complacent.

This criticism from Senator Fulbright is particularly interesting in view of the Senator's announcement about this time two years ago that, in the words of the Associated Press, "... he no longer is giving the FBI information it seeks in its security investigations. . . ."

To understand the relevance of this earlier Fulbright episode, it is necessary to have some clear notion of what the new Kremlin program aims at. In the *New Leader* Dr. David J. Dallin, one of the West's most authoritative students of Soviet strategy, has recently described the shift as a revival of the Communist "united front" tactics of the thirties.

"Khrushchev," Dr. Dallin continues, "is hoping to win over a majority of French and Italian Socialists, the white section of the British Labor party, the left Socialist group in Japan, certain groups in the United States, and influential segments of the German Social Democratic party. . . ."

Now Dr. Dallin's reference to "certain groups in the United States" is cryptic. But what groups in America are most likely the Beaver Laborites in Britain or the French and Italian Socialists?

It would be hard to find exact parallels, but we have some recent testimony on the general attitude toward Communism of one influential group in the United States. This recent testimony comes from David Riesman, one of the cultural heroes of the contemporary left, and an associate Nathan Glazer. These gentlemen are writing in the *Partisan Review*, perhaps the most austere intellectualized of all our journals of opinion. Say Riesman and Glazer:

"The postwar era . . . the focus . . . (from domestic) to foreign . . . the New Dealers . . . were generally

unprepared. In particular, they were not prepared to view the Communists and the Soviet Union as the enemy in the way they had earlier recognized fascism as the enemy. . . ."

"Not many New Dealers had actually been pro-Soviet: . . . preoccupied with domestic reforms and anti-fascism, they formed no clear-cut image of communism. They did not sympathize with it, let alone accept it, but they did not see it as a major enemy. . . ."

Here, of course, it has to be emphasized that the attitudes described by Messrs. Riesman and Glazer began in the popular-front days of the thirties. Thus they persisted during the later stages of the horrible massacre of the peasants. They persisted during the bloody purge trials of the later thirties. They persisted during the ever more monstrous manifestations of Stalinist espionage and imperialism in the early postwar years.

And yet even then—and this is the all-important point—even at the peak of the Stalinist atrocities, the groups described by Riesman and Glazer stuck stubbornly to one peculiar doctrine. It is described by Riesman and Glazer as follows:

" . . . Many of the intelligent (i.e., college educated) and articulate minority still . . . do not regard Communist infiltration as a serious problem; they do regard the threat to civil liberties by Communist hunters as a serious problem. . . ."

This last may be the reason why, in 1954, when he claimed (without proof) that the FBI was giving undue aid to Senator McCarthy, Senator Fulbright announced that he was no longer giving aid to the FBI. But from where Khrushchev and his advisers on Americana sit, can't you see how such episodes look to him?

If American liberals, including senators of the United States, declined to co-operate with the prime Government security agency in the monstrous wake of Stalinism, what could be expected to result from a Soviet shift to "coexistence"? If the liberals didn't fear Stalin at his blackest as they had feared Hitler, wouldn't they fear even less the smiling and popular-fronting Khrushchev?

No doubt Senator Fulbright is back in co-operation with the FBI by this time—maybe he has been back in co-operation since the Attorney General shattered his charges the day after he made them two years ago. And if Senator Fulbright speaks for the whole liberal left when he denounces Mr. Dulles for unvigilance in the face of the new Soviet tactic, perhaps the liberal left is now willing to view the threat of Soviet subversion as vigilantly as the rest of us have always done.

If the liberal left does feel that way now, if the long liberal drive to make special exceptions for people mixed up with communism, in the law, in the security programs, in the congressional hearings (exceptions long automatically denied to ordinary loyal Americans)—if this long liberal drive is over, all of us will feel easier as we face the refurbished Soviet.